arXiv:0707.3357v2 [math-ph] 24 Sep 2007

# Quantum Mechanics on Manifolds and Topological Effects [*]

G. Morchio
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa,
and INFN, Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

F. Strocchi
Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy
and INFN, Sezione di Pisa

## Abstract

A unique classification of the topological effects associated to quantum mechanics on manifolds is obtained on the basis of the invariance under diffeomorphisms and the realization of the Lie-Rinehart relations between the generators of the diffeomorphism group and the algebra of $C^\infty$ functions on the manifold. This leads to a unique ("Lie-Rinehart") $C^*$-algebra as observable algebra; its regular representations are shown to be locally Schroedinger and in one to one correspondence with the unitary representations of the fundamental group of the manifold. Therefore, in the absence of spin degrees of freedom and external fields, $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ appears as the only source of topological effects.

Math. Sub. Class.: 81Q70, 81R15, 81R10

Key words: Quantum mechanics, manifolds, quantum topological effects, Lie-Rinehart algebras

---

[*] A preliminary version of this work was presented as a joint work by the first author at the Workshop "Local Quantum Theory", Vienna Sept. 1997, and made available to the participants as hand written notes

# 1 Introduction

The standard formulation of Quantum mechanics (QM) is based on canonical quantization and its foundational problems have been clarified in terms of the identification of observable algebras and the classification of the corresponding states. A full control of their structure has been obtained by the identification of the observable algebra with the (unique $C^*$-)algebra generated by the exponentials of the canonical Heisenberg variables $q_i, p_i$ and by the uniqueness of its Hilbert space (regular) representation. The extension of such a strategy to a formulation of QM on manifolds still presents substantial open problems. The basic issue is the identification of the observable algebra playing the role of the Weyl algebra and in fact different choices have led to different mathematical structures and different physical results.

The first important result in this direction is due to Segal [1], who emphasized the role of the group $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ of diffeomorphisms of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and its action on the algebra $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ of $C^\infty$ functions on $\mathcal{M}$. His strategy can be read as the identification of the observable $C^*$-algebra as the crossed product $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ and his results essentially amount to a classification of its (regular) unitary representations, which satisfy the crucial additional assumption that $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is represented by a maximal abelian subalgebra. Actually, under this assumption one has a unique (Schroedinger) representation, apart from possible phase factors arising from the one dimensional cohomology of the manifold, leading to a very restricted class of topological effects.

The problem of QM on manifolds was rediscussed by Landsman [2], with the aim of a systematic analysis of topological effects. Following Mackey [3], Landsman considered quantum mechanical systems whose configuration space $Q$ can be represented as a homogeneous space $G/H$, with $G$ a locally compact group, $H$ a subgroup of $G$ and identified the observable $C^*$-algebra with the crossed product $G/H \times G$. In particular, if $Q$ is a manifold $\mathcal{M}$, $G$ can be a Lie subgroup of $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$; then $H$ is the stability group of one (arbitrary) point of $\mathcal{M}$ and the generators of $G$ play the role of momenta.

For a given $\mathcal{M}$, the so obtained QM crucially depends on $G$; in fact, different choices of $G$ lead to different $C^*$-algebras of observables and also to different topological effects. Furthermore, contrary to Segal's approach, one does not have invariance under diffeomorphisms (since $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ is not locally compact and does not have invariant proper subgroups [4]).

Segal's strategy of classifying representations of the entire $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ has been reproposed by Doebner et al. [5], who generalized Segal's analysis by relaxing the maximality of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and by allowing deviations from the Lie algebra relations of $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$, corresponding to the introduction of a (gauge) connection. On the other side, they restricted their analysis to the representations of the vector fields which generate Diff($\mathcal{M}$) in an $L^2$ space of sections of a vector bundle over the manifold, with finite dimensional fibers, with suitable differentiability properties. A classification of such representations in terms of topological effects is obtained under additional simplifying assumptions, with results which only partially compare with those by Landsman.

The occurrence of quantum topological effects has been investigated also within approaches to QM in terms of classical trajectories (path integral and Bohmian mechanics) [6], naturally leading to a classification in terms of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ of the manifold.

The restrictions and choices underlying the above analyses, while technically effective in view of the resulting classifications, leave open the question of the validity and derivation of the so obtained effects on the ground of general basic principles. The aim of this note is to provide a formulation of QM on manifolds exclusively based on the identification of a unique observable algebra from fundamental (physical) principles (excluding for the moment spin degrees of freedom and external fields):
1) (**Localization and Lie relations**.) The observable algebra should be generated by localized variables playing the role of positions and momenta. This leads to choose as position observables $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, the $C^\infty$ functions on $\mathcal{M}$ of compact support, and, as "momentum" observables, variables $T_v$ indexed by a Lie algebra of vector fields $v$ of compact support, reproducing the linear and Lie algebra relations between the vector fields $v$ and their action as derivations on $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$.
2) (**Diffeomorphism invariance**.) The identification of the observable algebra should be independent of any choice of coordinates or of additional geometrical constraints, i.e. it should be diffeomorphism invariant. This leads to take the Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ of *all* the $C^\infty$ vector fields of compact support; this is actually the only possibility for compact $\mathcal{M}$, since there is no diffeomorphism invariant subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$.

It is important that, without additional qualifications, different vectors fields are treated as independent and therefore, even at the local level, one has no relation between the number of independent momenta and the dimension of the manifold, as one would expect on physical grounds. The point is that the Lie relations between Diff($\mathcal{M}$) and $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ are a too general mathematical structure and their interpretation is far from unique; in particular the same Lie relations appear in the description of all $N$ particle systems on the same manifold $\mathcal{M}$, as the non-relativistic local current algebra relations [7]. Moreover, a general classification of the representations of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times$ Diff($\mathcal{M}$) is a difficult open mathematical problem. In fact, the additional *ad hoc* re-

quirements introduced in the literature (maximality of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ by Segal, fiber bundle restrictions by Doebner et al. and restrictions to subgroups of Diff($\mathcal{M}$) by Landsman) have the purpose and the effect of simplifying the mathematical problem through an elimination of unwanted degrees of freedom; however, as discussed above, the so derived quantum mechanical effects substantially depend on such optional choices. A way out of such unwanted degrees of freedom, compatibly with the above requirements 1,2, is obtained by taking into account the dependence relations between vector fields through multiplication by $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, i.e. by realizing that the Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ of vector fields is a (diffeomorphism invariant) module over $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$. Actually, it is enough to realize such dependence relations at the strictly local level, i.e. for vector fields and $C^\infty$ functions with supports in regions $\mathcal{O}$ diffeomorphic to open spheres. This argument leads to
3) (**Elimination of redundant degrees of freedom**.) The momenta $T_v$, indexed by vector fields $v$, satisfy the following algebraic relations

$$T_{fv} = \tfrac{1}{2}(fT_v + T_v f), \quad \forall f \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}),\ \forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}). \tag{1.1}$$

Mathematically, the algebraic operations in the right hand side of eq. (1.10 is assumed to reproduce the intrinsic Lie-Rinehart product $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}) \times \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$ which makes $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$ a Lie-Rinehart (LR) algebra over $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ [8].

In order to define a $C^*$-algebra of observables on the basis of 1-3 we take as generators the algebra $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, the one parameter groups $U(\lambda v)$, and the resolvents $R_v$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$, (of the corresponding generators $T_v$), in terms of which condition (1.1) can be imposed. In this way we shall obtain a unique $C^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ (Sect. 2).

The module structure of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ on $\mathcal{M}$, together with its vector bundle structure on $\mathcal{M}$, gives rise to a Lie algebroid and the relevance of this geometric structure for the problem of quantization of Poisson manifolds has been discussed in the literature (see [9], [10]). However, the vector bundle structure cannot be shared by the quantum observable algebra and the standard crossed product $C^*$ structure associated to the corresponding Lie groupoid is not enough, since it does not include and does not imply the product relations (1.1) for the generators of the Lie groupoid. On the other hand, as discussed above, the LR relations (1.1) and their local structure are essential ingredients for the very identification of the observable $C^*$-algebra and for a unique classification of the topological effects associated to QM on manifolds. With respect to the crossed product $C^*$-algebra, $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is therefore a better candidate for a $C^*$-algebraic non-commutative version of the cotangent bundle on $\mathcal{M}$ with its symplectic structure.

The main result of this note is the classification of all the representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, in which $U(\lambda v)$ are strongly continuous in $\lambda$ and the generators satisfy the Lie algebra relations on a dense invariant domain (*regular representations*). All such representations will be shown to be locally, i.e. for regions $\mathcal{O}$ as above, unitarily equivalent, apart from multiplicities, to the Schroedinger representation in $\mathcal{H} \equiv L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu)$, in which $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ act as multiplication operators and $\forall \psi \in \mathcal{H}$, $g \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$

$$U(g)\psi(x) = \psi(g^{-1}x)J(g,x), \quad J(g,x) \equiv [d\mu(g^{-1}x)/d\mu(x)]^{1/2} \tag{1.2}$$

with $d\mu$ absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesque measure (Sect. 3).

Globally, as a consequence of the elimination at the local level of the redundant degrees of freedom (Lie-Rinehart $C^*$-algebra), the regular representations are in one to one correspondence with the unitary irreducible representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$, the first homotopy group of $\mathcal{M}$, which thus appears as the only source of topological effects, in the absence of additional locally observable degrees of freedom and external fields modifying the Lie product of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$. In particular, for simply connected manifolds one has a uniqueness theorem as the Von Neumann theorem for the Weyl algebra (Sect. 4).

All the regular representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ can be realized as Schroedinger representations on functions on the universal covering space of $\mathcal{M}$, yielding unitary representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$. It is worthwhile to remark that the role of the universal covering space of $\mathcal{M}$ here emerges from first principles, rather than from the somewhat arbitrary classification of the "classical trajectories" in the functional integral formulation. The intrinsic *a priori* topological structure is in fact that of the universal covering group of the diffeomorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$ and it is a non trivial consequence of the Lie-Rinehart relations that it reduces to the fundamental group of $\mathcal{M}$.

## 2 Lie-Rinehart $C^*$-algebra

In this Section, we discuss how to associate to the family of Lie-Rinehart algebras $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$, a unique "Lie-Rinehart" $C^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$. We adopt the following

**Notations**:
$\mathcal{M}$ a connected $C^\infty$ manifold of dimension $d$,
$\mathcal{O}$ any subset of $\mathcal{M}$ diffeomorphic to an open sphere,
$\mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ the connected component of the identity of the group of diffeomorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$,
$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$ the Lie algebra of $C^\infty$ vector fields $v$ of compact support in $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}$, respectively,

$g(\lambda v)$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, the associated one parameter groups, which exist by compactness of $\mathrm{supp}\, v$,

$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ the subgroup of Diff($\mathcal{M}$) generated by the $g(\lambda v)$,

$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ its universal covering group, which is uniquely associated to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ ( [4], Theor.8.1) and is generated by the elements of a neighborhood of the identity in $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ and therefore by the one parameters groups $g(\lambda v)$,

$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{O})$ the subgroup of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ generated by the one parameter groups $g(\lambda v)$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$,

$C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ the *-algebra of $C^\infty$ complex functions on $\mathcal{M}$, with support in $\mathcal{O}$,

$C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ the *-algebra of $C^\infty$ complex functions with compact support in $\mathcal{M}$,

$\tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ the *-algebra generated by $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and the constant functions,

$\Pi(\mathcal{M})$ the crossed product $\Pi(\mathcal{M}) \equiv \tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$.

The requirements 1,2 lead to consider the *-algebra generated by $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and the elements $U(\lambda v) \equiv U(g(\lambda v))$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, with

$$\alpha^*(x) \equiv \bar{\alpha}(x), \;\; \forall \alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \;\;\; U(g)^* \equiv U(g^{-1}), \;\; \forall g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M}), \tag{2.1}$$

with the Lie algebra relations between vector fields and $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ codified by the crossed product relations, $\forall g, h \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$, $\alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$

$$U(g)\alpha(x)U(g)^{-1} = \alpha(g^{-1}x) \equiv \alpha_g(x), \;\;\; U(g)U(h) = U(gh). \tag{2.2}$$

Thus, we are led to the * crossed product $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$.

In order to impose the LR condition (1.1), since the momenta $T_v$ cannot be bounded operators, we consider the *-algebra generated by $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$ and the elements $R_v$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$, playing the role of the resolvents of the generators of the corresponding $U(\lambda v)$, formally $R_v = (T_v - i)^{-1}$. Since in Hilbert space representations, from the spectral representation of $T_v$, one has (in the operator norm topology)

$$\mathrm{norm} - \lim_{\lambda \to 0} [\, i(U(\lambda v) - \mathbf{1}\,)/\lambda - i\,\mathbf{1}\; ]\, R_v^2 = R_v, \tag{2.3}$$

this equation will be taken as the basic relation between $R_v$ and $U(\lambda v)$, at the algebraic level.

Furthermore, the elements $R_v$ are required to satisfy the standard relations with their adjoints

$$R_v - R_v^* = 2i R_v\, R_v^* = 2i R_v^*\, R_v, \quad\; R_v^* = -R_{-v}. \tag{2.4}$$

The Lie algebra relations obeyed by the $T_v$ yield for the resolvents

$$U(g)\, R_v\, U(g)^{-1} = R_{gv}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $gv$ is the adjoint action of $g$ on $v$.

The LR relations can be written in terms of the resolvents as

$$R_{\alpha v}\,\alpha - R_v = R_{\alpha v}\,i(1-\alpha)\,R_v - \tfrac{1}{2}\,R_{\alpha v}\,\alpha'_v\,R_v, \tag{2.6}$$

$\forall\alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}), \forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$, $\alpha'_v \equiv [\,v,\,\alpha\,] = -i\,d[U(-\lambda v)\alpha U(\lambda v)]/d\lambda|_{\lambda=0}$. In fact, eq. (2.6) is obtained by multiplying eq. (1.1) by $R_v$ and $R_{\alpha v}$ on the right and on the left, respectively.

In conclusion, eqs. (2.1-2, 2.4-6) define an abstract $^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathcal{M})$ which incorporates the algebraic relations of the Lie-Rinehart algebras $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$ in terms of bounded operators. In order to make it a $C^*$-algebra we introduce as $C^*$ norm the sup of the $C^*$ norms of $\mathcal{A}_0(M)$ which satisfy eq. (2.3); the existence of at least one such a $C^*$ norm is guaranteed by a (non trivial) representation of $\mathcal{A}_0(M)$, differentiable in the group parameters and satisfying (1.1) (see Sect. 3). The sup of such $C^*$ norms is finite on $\mathcal{A}_0(M)$, because, for all $C^*$ norms, $||U(g)|| = 1$, $||R_v|| \leq 1$, as a consequence of eq. (2.4), which implies $||R_v||^2 = ||R_v^* R_v|| \leq ||R_v||$. Moreover,

$$||\alpha|| \leq \inf\{K : |\lambda| > K \Rightarrow (\alpha-\lambda)^{-1} \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})\} = \sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}} |\alpha(x)|. \tag{2.7}$$

Actually, from the Schroedinger representation of $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathcal{M})$, (see below), it follows that $||\alpha|| = \sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}} |\alpha(x)|$ and the $C^*$-algebra generated by $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is $C_0^0(\mathcal{M})$. The result is a unique $C^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, which can be considered as the "*Lie-Rinehart $C^*$-algebra of $\mathcal{M}$*".

The definition of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is invariant under Diff($\mathcal{M}$) and in fact $\Gamma_g(A) \equiv U(g)AU(g)^{-1}$, $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$, defines a group of inner automorphisms of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, acting as diffeomorphism on $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and on the vector fields which index the resolvents. We denote by $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$ the subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ generated by $\alpha, U(\lambda v), R_v$ with supp $\alpha$, supp $v \subset \mathcal{O}$.

# 3 Regular representations of the Lie-Rinehart $C^*$-algebra

The notion of regular representations of the crossed product $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$ is well known and amounts to the strong continuity of the one parameter subgroups $U(\lambda v)$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}, v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$. By eq. (2.3) this property implies that $R_v = (T_v - i)^{-1}$ on $(\ker R_v)^\perp$. On the other side, if ker $R_v = \{0\}$, eq. (2.3) implies strong continuity of $U(\lambda v)$ and $R_v = (T_v - i)^{-1}$. We are thus led to

**Definition 3.1** *A representation* $\pi$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ *is* **regular** *if i) the representatives* $\pi(U(\lambda v))$ *are strongly continuous in* $v$ *in the* $C^\infty$ *topology of the vector fields and differentiable in* $\lambda$, *ii) the generators* $T_v = i\, d\, \pi(U(\lambda v))/d\lambda|_{\lambda=0}$ *exist on a common dense domain* $D$ *invariant under* $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ *and represent* $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ *there, iii) ker* $\pi(R_v) = \{0\}$, $\forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$, *and* $\pi(C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})) \neq 0$.

The same notion applies to representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$. As remarked before, the mere differentiability in $\lambda$ of the $\pi(U(\lambda v))$ follows from eq. (2.3) and iii). Condition iii) excludes subrepresentations with $\pi(R_v) = 0$ and trivial representations of $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, yielding one dimensional representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$.

**Proposition 3.2** *In a regular representaion* $\pi$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, *the generators* $T_v$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, *are essentially self-adjoint on* $D$ *and satisfy* $(T_v - i)^{-1} = \pi(R_v)$, *and on* $D$

$$T_{\sum_i \alpha_i v_i} = \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_i (\alpha_i T_{v_i} + T_{v_i} \alpha_i), \quad \forall \alpha_i \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}_i), \;\; \forall v_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_i). \tag{3.1}$$

*Proof.* Essential self-adjointness on $D$ follows from invariance of $D$ under the groups $\pi(U(\lambda v))$, as in the proof of Stone's theorem. Eq. (2.3) implies that $\mathrm{Range}\,(T_v \pm i) \supset \pi(R_{\pm v})\mathcal{H}$, which is dense by condition iii), $\ker \pi(R_{\pm v}) = \{0\}$ and eq. (2.4). Therefore, $T_v$ is essentially self-adjoint on $\pi(R_v)^2\,\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, $\pi(R_v)$ and $(T_v - i)^{-1}$ coincide on the dense domain $\pi(R_v)\mathcal{H}$, and therefore on $\mathcal{H}$, so that the self-adjointness domain $D(T_v)$ is $\pi(R_v)\mathcal{H}$. Hence $D \subseteq \pi(R_v)\mathcal{H}$, $\forall v$. Eq. (2.6) gives

$$\pi(R_v)\,[T_{\alpha v} - \tfrac{1}{2}(\alpha T_v + T_v \alpha)\,]\,\pi(R_{\alpha v}) = 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}), \; \forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$$

and therefore eq. (1.1) holds on $D \cap \pi(R_{\alpha v})\mathcal{H} = D$. Eq. (3.1) follows from condition ii). □

For the classification of the regular representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ the following notions are useful

**Definition 3.3** *A Schroedinger representation* $\pi$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$ *is a representation in* $\mathcal{H}_\pi = L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu)$, *with* $d\mu$ *equivalent to the Lebesgue measure in any coordinate system, of the following form,* $\forall \psi \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$

$$(\pi(a)\psi)(x) = \alpha(x)\psi(x)\,, \quad \forall \alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}), \tag{3.2}$$

$$(\pi(U(\lambda v))\psi)(x) = \psi(g(\lambda v)^{-1}x)\; J(g(\lambda v), x)\,, \quad \forall v \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O}), \tag{3.3}$$

$$(\pi(R_v)\psi)(x) = ((T_v - i)^{-1}\psi)(x). \tag{3.4}$$

*Thanks to the isometry* $\psi(x) \to [\, d\mu_2(x)/d\mu_1(x)\,]^{-1/2}\psi(x)$ *all Schroedinger representations* $\pi$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$ *are unitarily equivalent, and therefore one may refer to* **the Schroedinger representation** $\pi_S$.

**Definition 3.4** *Two representations* $\pi_1$, $\pi_2$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ *are locally quasi equivalent if* $\pi_1(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})) \simeq \pi_2(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}))$*, for all* $O$.

*A representation* $\pi$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ *is locally Schroedinger if it is locally quasi equivalent to the Schroedinger representation* $\pi_S$.

Since $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ acts by inner automorphisms on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, $\pi_1(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})) \simeq \pi_2(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}))$ for a single $\mathcal{O}$ implies quasi equivalence for all $\mathcal{O}$. Within the equivalence class of locally Schroedinger representations, one may take $d\mu(x) = dx$, $x \in \mathcal{O}$, in local coordinates, so that the representation is regular with $D = C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$. In this section we shall prove the following

**Theorem 3.5** *All regular representations* $\pi$ *of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ *are locally Schroedinger. Each* $\pi$ *is uniquely determined by the collection* $\{\pi(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})),\ \mathcal{O}$ *diffeomorphic to spheres* $\}$.

It is worthwhile to remark the relation with the representations of the crossed product $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$:

**Definition 3.6** *A representation* $\pi$ *of the crossed product* $\Pi(\mathcal{M}) = \tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ *is* **Lie-Rinehart (LR) regular** *if it satisfies conditions i), ii) of Definition 3.1, eq. (1.1) and* $\pi(C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})) \neq 0$. $\pi(\Pi(\mathcal{M}))$ *is locally Schroedinger if eqs. (3.2-3) hold.*

**Theorem 3.7** *LR regular representations of the crossed product* $\Pi(\mathcal{M}) = \tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ *define regular representations of* $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ *and viceversa. In particular they are locally Schroedinger and are determined by their restrictions to the corresponding local subalgebras.*

*Proof.* Given a LR regular representation $\pi$ of $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$, the concrete algebra generated by $\pi(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M}))$ and the family of $R_v \equiv (T_v - i)^{-1}$, with $T_v$ the generator of $\pi(U(g(\lambda v))$, represents $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, the LR relations, eq. (2.6), following from eq. (1.1). The converse follows from Proposition 3.2. The last statement follows from Theorem 3.5. $\square$

**Lemma 3.8** *A regular irreducible representation $\pi$ of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is defined in a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\pi$. Any such a representation is unitarily equivalent to one with*

$$\mathcal{H}_\pi = L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K,$$

*where $d\mu$ is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{M}$ (in any coordinate system). For all vectors of $\mathcal{H}_\pi$, i.e. for all $L^2$ functions $\psi : \mathcal{M} \to K$, the representation is defined by*

$$\pi(\alpha)\psi(x) = \alpha(x)\psi(x), \quad \pi(U(g)) = C_g V_g, \tag{3.5}$$

$$C_g\psi(x) \equiv \psi(g^{-1}x)\,[d\mu(g^{-1}x)/d\mu(x)]^{1/2}, \quad V_g\psi(x) = V_g(x)\psi(x), \tag{3.6}$$

*$V_g(x)$ a family of unitary operators in $K$, weakly measurable in $x$, satisfying*

$$C_h^{-1}\, V_g(x)\, C_h = V_g(hx), \tag{3.7}$$

$$V_g(hx)V_h(x) = V_{gh}(x). \tag{3.8}$$

*Two regular irreducible representations $\pi_1$, $\pi_2$ of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ are unitarily equivalent iff there exists a weakly measurable family of unitary operators $S(x) : K \to K$, such that*

$$S(gx)\, V_g^{(1)}(x)\, S(x)^{-1} = V_g^{(2)}(x). \tag{3.9}$$

*Proof.* $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is separable in the norm topology, (see eq. (2.7)); as a vector space, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ is separable in the $C^\infty$ topology and the strong continuity of $v \to U(\lambda v)$, condition i), implies separability of $\pi(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M}))$ in the strong topology; condition i) implies the strong continuity of $v \to R_v$ (Theorem VIII.20 of Ref. [11]). Hence $\pi(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}))$ is separable in the strong topology and all the cyclic representations, in particular the irreducible ones, are defined in a separable space.

Since the one point compactification of $\mathcal{M}$, $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$, is the spectrum of the norm closure of $\tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, any $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$ defines a (Borel) measure on $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ and therefore, by separability, $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_\pi = \oplus \sum_n L^2(\dot{\mathcal{M}}, d\mu_n), \tag{3.10}$$

with $\pi(C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}))$ acting as multiplication operators and $d\mu_n$ the Borel measures on $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ defined by a maximal set of vectors $\Psi_n$ giving rise to a sequence of cyclic representations of $\tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$.

Since condition iii) excludes one dimensional representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ corresponding to the point at infinity of $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$, one may replace $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\mathcal{M}$. Hence, by defining e.g. the measure $d\nu(x) \equiv \sum_n 2^{-n} d\mu_n(x)$, one has $d\mu_n(x) = G_n^2(x) d\nu(x)$, with $G_n(x)$ $d\nu$-measurable functions and

$$(\Psi,\, \Phi)_{\mathcal{H}_\pi} = \sum_n \int d\nu(x) \overline{\Psi_n}(x)\, \Phi_n(x)\, G_n^2(x), \quad \mathcal{H}_\pi = \int d\nu(x)\, \mathcal{H}(x), \qquad (3.11)$$

with $\mathcal{H}(x) \subset l^2$, $\dim \mathcal{H}(x)$ a measurable function of $x$.
The absolute continuity of $d\nu$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure (in any coordinate system) obviously amounts to that of $d\mu_n$, $\forall n$. Hence, it is enough to prove that for any Borel set $S \subset \mathcal{O}$ of zero Lebesgue measure, one has $\mu_n(S) = 0$, $\forall n$. In fact, for $|\lambda| < \varepsilon$,

$$\mu_n(S^\lambda) \equiv \int d\mu_n(x)\, \chi_S(x+\lambda) = (\Psi_n,\, \chi_S^\lambda\, \Psi_n)$$

is a positive continuous function of $\lambda$, because $x \to x + \lambda$, $x \in \mathcal{O}$, can be obtained by the action of the groups $U(\lambda v)$, which are strongly continuous in $\lambda$, by condition i). Then, by the Fubini-Tonelli theorem

$$\int d\lambda\, \mu_n(S^\lambda) = \int d\mu_n(x) \int d\lambda\, \chi_S(x+\lambda) = 0\,,$$

which implies $\mu_n(S) = 0$. Hence $d\nu$ is of the form $N(x)dx$, and the function $d(x) \equiv$ cardinality of the set $\{n,\, N(x)G_n^2(x) > 0.\, x \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is measurable (as a sum of the measurable functions $\theta(N(x)G_n^2(x))$); $d(x)$ is invariant under $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$, because so are the measurable sets $A_n \equiv \{x, d(x) = n\}$, $n = 0, 1 ... \infty$, since, a.e., $d(x) = \dim \mathcal{H}(x)$. Therefore, $d(x)$ is constant, a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure, since $\int dx\ \chi_{A_n}(x)[\alpha(x) - \alpha(x+\lambda)] = 0$, $\forall \alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ and only the constant functions are orthogonal to $\alpha(x) - \alpha(x+\lambda)$, $\forall \alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O})$, $\forall \mathcal{O}$. Thus $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ is of the form $L^2(\mathcal{M}, dx) \times K$ and the first of eqs. (3.5) holds by construction.
The operators $C_{g(\lambda v)}$ are unitary and strongly continuous and therefore so are the $V_g$ defined by eqs. (3.5), (3.6). Moreover, $\forall \alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O})$, $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$

$$V_g \alpha \psi \equiv C_g^{-1} U(g) \alpha \psi = C_g^{-1} \alpha_g U(g) \psi = \alpha C_g^{-1} U(g) \psi = \alpha V_g \psi,$$

and therefore $V_g$ are decomposable operators, i.e. they define a weakly measurable family of unitary operators $V_g(x)$ (Theorem 7.10 of Ref. [12]).
Eq. (3.7) follows from eq. (3.6) and eq. (3.8) follows from from eq. (2.2) and eqs. (3.6), (3.7).

The equivalence of irreducible representations of the form (3.5),(3.6) implies $\dim K_1 = \dim K_2$, since $\dim K_i$ is the multiplicity of $\pi(C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}))$. Then, identifying $K_1 = K_2$, $S\pi_1 S^{-1} = \pi_2$ implies that $S$ commutes with $\pi_i(C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}))$ and, therefore, by the same argument as above, it defines a weakly measurable family of unitary operators $S(x) : K \to K$. $\square$

For the local analysis of the representation it is convenient to consider, for each region $\mathcal{O}$, $d$ vector fields $v_i \in \lambda(\mathcal{O}')$, $\mathcal{O}' \supset \mathcal{O}$, which define cartesian coordinates in $\mathcal{O}$; henceforth, $\mathcal{O}$ will be identified with the unit ball in $\mathbf{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$ will denote the corresponding sphere of radius $\varepsilon$. The one parameter groups generated by such vector fields will be denoted by $g_i(\lambda_i)$; then, $\forall x \in \mathcal{O}$, for $x + \lambda \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\lambda$ small one has

$$g[\lambda]x = x + \lambda, \quad g[\lambda] \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{d} g_i(\lambda_i). \tag{3.12}$$

The diffeomorphisms $g[\lambda]$ depend on the choice of the defining factors $g_i[\lambda_i]$ and need not to commute, even for small $\lambda$, since eq. (3.12) holds only for $x \in \mathcal{O}$. However, the LR relations, eq. (1.1), allow to transfer the local cartesian structure of the one parameter subgroups $g_i(\lambda_i)$ to the operators $U(g[\lambda])$, i.e.

**Lemma 3.9** *For all $\alpha$ with support in $\mathcal{O}_{1/2}$, $\lambda, \mu$ small, one has*

$$U(g[\lambda])\, U(g[\mu])\, \alpha = U(g[\lambda + \mu])\, \alpha. \tag{3.13}$$

*Proof.* It suffices to prove eq. (3.13) for the one parameter subgroups, i.e. $U(g_1(\lambda_1))\, U(g_2(\lambda_2))\, \alpha = U(g_2(\lambda_2))\, U(g_1(\lambda_1))\, \alpha$. For this purpose we compute, for $\lambda, \mu$ small, $|\mu| < |\lambda_1|$, on the common invariant domain $D$,

$$(d/d\mu)\, U(g_1(\lambda_1 - \mu))\, U(g_2(\lambda_2))\, U(g_1(\mu))\, \alpha =$$

$$= i\, U(g_1(\lambda_1 - \mu))\, U(g_2(\lambda_2))\, (T_{g_2 v_1} - T_{v_1})\, \alpha_{g_1(\mu)}\, U(g_1(\mu)) = 0,$$

where the covariance eqs. (2.2), (2,5), yielding $U((g_2(\lambda_2))^{-1}\, T_{v_1}\, U(g_2(\lambda_2)) = T_{g_2 v_1}$, have been used and the last equality follows from the LR relations, eq. (3.1), since $g_2 v_1$ and $v_1$ coincide on the support of $\alpha_{g_1(\mu)}$, for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$ small enough. $\square$

**Lemma 3.10** *For $\lambda$, $\mu$ small, $\forall x \in \mathcal{O}_{1/2}$, one has*

$$V_{g[\lambda]}(g[\mu]x)\; V_{g[\mu]}(x) = V_{g[\lambda+\mu]}(x). \tag{3.14}$$

*Moreover, a.e. in y,*

$$W_y(x) \equiv V_{g[x-y]}(y), \quad x, y \in \mathcal{O}, \tag{3.15}$$

*define a family of unitary operators in $K$, weakly measurable in $x$, and therefore a unitary operator $W_y$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O}, dx) \times K$, given by $W_y\psi(x) = W_y(x)\psi(x)$; $\forall x$, $y \in \mathcal{O}_{1/3}$, $\lambda$ small they satisfy*

$$W_y^{-1}(g[\lambda]x)V_{g[\lambda]}(x)W_y(x) = \mathbf{1}\,, \quad a.e.\ in\ y. \tag{3.16}$$

*Proof.* Eq. (3.14) follows from eqs. (3.8) since, by eq. (3.13),

$$V_{g[\lambda]\,g[\mu]}\,\alpha = C^{-1}_{g[\lambda]\,g[\mu]}U(g[\lambda]\,g[\mu])\,\alpha = C^{-1}_{g[\lambda+\mu]}\,U(g[\lambda+\mu])\,\alpha = V_{g[\lambda+\mu]}\,\alpha.$$

Moreover, $\forall\psi \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$, with $\operatorname{supp}\psi \subset \mathcal{O}$, $V_{g[\lambda]}(x)\,\psi(x)$ is continuous in $\lambda$ as an element of $L^2(\mathcal{O},\, dx) \times K$ as a consequence of Lemma 3.8 and the strong continuity of the one parameter subgroups $g_i(\lambda_i)$. This implies that, $\forall\chi \in K$, $F(\lambda, x) \equiv (\chi,\, V_{g[\lambda]}(x)\,\psi(x))_K$ is a continuous function of $\lambda$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\, dx)$. Given a basis $e_n(x)$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\, dx)$, $F(\lambda, x) = \sum c_n(\lambda)\, e_n(x)$, with $c_n(\lambda)$ continuous in $\lambda$. Hence, $V_{g[\lambda=x-y]}(x)$ is measurable in $x$ and $y$ and therefore, by the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, in $x$ a.e. in $y$. Eq. (3.16) follows from eq. (3.14) since

$$V_{g[\lambda]}(x)\,W_y(x) = V_{g[\lambda]}(g[x-y]y)\,V_{g[x-y]}(y) = V_{g[\lambda+x-y]}(y) =$$

$$= W_y(x+\lambda) = W_y(g[\lambda]x). \quad \square$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* By using the above Lemmas, $\forall\alpha$ with $\operatorname{supp}\alpha \subset \mathcal{O}$, $\forall U(g[\lambda])$, $|\lambda| < \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon = 1/8d$, a.e. in $y$, $y \in \mathcal{O}_\delta$, $\delta << \varepsilon$, one has

$$W_y^{-1}(x)\,U(g[\lambda])\,W_y(x)\,\alpha(x) = W_y^{-1}(x)\,C_{g[\lambda]}\,V_{g[\lambda]}(x)\,W_y(x)\,\alpha(x) =$$

$$= C_{g[\lambda]}\,W_y^{-1}(g[\lambda]x)\,V_{g[\lambda]}(x)\,W_y(x)\,\alpha(x) = C_{g[\lambda]}\,\alpha(x).$$

This implies, on $D$,

$$-i\,T_{v_i}\alpha(x) = W_y(x)\,d/d\lambda_i\,C_{g[\lambda]}|_{\lambda=0}\,\alpha(x)\,W_y^{-1}(x)$$

so that $\forall v = \sum \alpha_i(x)\, v_i$, with $\operatorname{supp}\alpha_i \subset \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$, and therefore $\forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon)$, the LR relations (3.1) imply

$$T_v = \sum_i T_{v_i}\,\alpha_i(x) + i\alpha'_{v_i} = W_y(x)\,id/d\lambda\,C_{g(\lambda v)}|_{\lambda=0}\,W_y(x)^{-1}, \tag{3.17}$$

where the last equality follows from the LR relations for the generators in the Schroedinger representation. The same equation is satisfied by any extension of

$W_y(x)$ to $x$ outside $\mathcal{O}$, e.g. $W_y(x) = 1$, for $x \notin \mathcal{O}$. Eq. (3.16) provides therefore a unitary equivalemce in $L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K$ which extends to the exponentials and the resolvents by the essential self-adjointness of the $T_v$ on $D$.
In conclusion, the local properties of the unitary operators $W_y(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{M}$, imply the quasi equivalence of $\pi(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}))$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K$ to the Schroedinger representation $\pi_S(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}))$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M}, dx)$: $\forall \psi \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K, \;\; A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$,

$$\pi(A)\psi = W_y \, \pi_S(A) \, W_y^{-1} \psi, \quad \text{a.e. in } y \in \mathcal{O}. \tag{3.18}$$

In particular, for $A = U(g)$, $\forall g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{O})$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{M}$, one has

$$(\pi(U(g))\psi)(x) = C_g W_y(gx) \, W_y(x) \psi(x), \;\; \text{i.e. } V_g(x) = W_y(gx) \, W_y(x)^{-1}. \tag{3.19}$$

Since, by the regularity condition ii) of Definition 3.1, the generators satisfy $T_{v = \sum_i v_i} = \sum_i T_{v_i}$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, by the compactness of the support of $v$ and the essential self-adjointness on $D$, $T_v$ is uniquely determined (as a self-adjoint operator) by the $T_{v_i}$, $v_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_i)$. Hence the representation is uniquely determined by the $\pi(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}_i))$. □

## 4 Classification of the regular representations and topological effects

For the classification of the regular representations one has to analyze the extension of the local characterization of the unitary operators $V_{g(\lambda v)}(x)$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$, eq. (3.19), to the general case $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$. This will be done by following the integral curves $\gamma(v, \lambda, x) \equiv \{g(\mu v)x, \, 0 \leq \mu \leq \lambda \}$, $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, patching together the local action of $V_{g(\lambda v_i)}$, eq. (3.19), $v_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_i)$. The resulting characterization of the $V_{g(\lambda v)}$ will depend on the equivalence class of the path $\gamma(v, \lambda)$, so that the classification will turn out to be provided by the unitary representations of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$.

For this purpose we start with the following preparatory Lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1** *The unitary operators $W_y(x)$, defined by eq. (3.15), satisfy*
*i) $W_y(x)^{-1} = W_x(y)$, a. e. in $(x, y) \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{O}$,*
*ii) $\mathcal{W}(y, x) \equiv W_z(y) \, W_z(x)^{-1}$, $x$, $y$, $z \in \mathcal{O}$, is independent of $z$ a.e. in $\mathcal{O}$ and therefore it is well defined a.e. in $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and a.e. in $y \in \mathcal{O}$ and satisfies*

$$\mathcal{W}(y, x) \, \mathcal{W}(x, \, z) = \mathcal{W}(y, \, z). \tag{4.1}$$

*Proof.* Property i) follows trivially from the definition (3.15) and eq. (3.8). The independence of $z$ in ii) follows from i) and eq. (3.8), and implies eq. (4.1) $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{O} \diagdown I$, $I$ a set of zero measure. □

**Lemma 4.2** *Let $\gamma(y,x)$ be a $C^\infty$ curve starting at $x$ and ending at $y$, and $\gamma(y,x) = \gamma(y,x_n) \circ \gamma(x_n,x_{n-1}) \circ ... \gamma(x_1,x)$ be a partition such that $\gamma(x_{i+1},x_i) \in \mathcal{O}_i$, then*

$$\mathcal{W}(y,x,\gamma(y,x)) \equiv \mathcal{W}(y,z_n)\,\mathcal{W}(z_n,z_{n-1})...\mathcal{W}(z_1,x), \tag{4.2}$$

*is independent of the points $z_i \in \mathcal{O}_{i-1} \cap \mathcal{O}_i$ and of the partition chosen in eq. (4.2); it depends only on the (homotopic) equivalence class $[\gamma(y,x)]$, i.e. $\mathcal{W}(y,x,\gamma(y,x)) = \mathcal{W}(y,x,[\gamma(y,x)])$. Furthermore, $\forall x,y,z, \in \mathcal{M}$*

$$\mathcal{W}(y,x,[\gamma(y,x)])\,\mathcal{W}(x,z,[\gamma(x,z)]) = \mathcal{W}(y,z,[\gamma(y,x) \circ \gamma(x,z)]). \tag{4.3}$$

*The operators $\mathcal{W}(x,x,[\gamma]) : K \to K$ are well defined a.e. in $x \in \mathcal{M}$ by ii) of Lemma 4.1 and define unitary representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$, which are unitarily equivalent for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$.*

*Proof.* The construction (4.2) is independent of the addition and displacement of an intermediate point as a consequence of eq. (4.1). The composition law (4.3) follows from eq. (4.2) with $x$ as intermediate point. Given $x$ and $y$, an equivalence relation between the closed curves $\gamma(x,x)$, and $\gamma(y,y)$ is given by $[\gamma(y,y)] = [\bar\gamma(y,x) \circ \gamma(x,x) \circ \bar\gamma(x,y)^{-1}]$, with $\bar\gamma(x,y)$ a fixed curve; then the unitary equivalence of the representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ is given by $\mathcal{W}(y,x,[\bar\gamma(y,x)])$. □

**Lemma 4.3** *The operators*

$$\mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda v)}(x) \equiv \mathcal{W}(g(\lambda v)x, x, [\gamma(v)]), \quad v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}), \tag{4.4}$$

*with $\gamma(v) \equiv \gamma(v, g(\lambda v)x, x)$ the integral curve of $v$ starting at $x$ and ending at $g(\lambda v)x$, define, for fixed $v$, $\lambda$, a family of unitary operators in $K$, weakly measurable in $x$, and therefore unitary operators in $L^2(\mathcal{M},dx) \times K$, with the following properties*
*i) $\forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, $h \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda v)}(x)\,C_h = C_h \mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda v)}(hx)$$

*ii) $\mathcal{U}(g(\lambda v)) \equiv C_{g(\lambda v)}\,\mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda v)}(x)$ form a one parameter group in $\lambda$*
*iii) $\forall v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, for all $\mathcal{O}$, $\mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda v)}(x) = \mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda \tilde v)}(x) = V_{g(\lambda \tilde v)}(x)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{O}_{1/2}$, $\lambda$ small enough, $\forall \tilde v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O})$ with $\tilde v = v$ in $\mathcal{O}_{3/4}$.*

*Proof.* Property i) follows from the definition and properties of the $\mathcal{W}$ as a family of unitary operators in $L^2(\mathcal{M},dx) \times K$. The group properties follow from those of the $\mathcal{W}$, eq. (4.3), and from property i). Property iii) follows from the definition of the $\mathcal{W}$ and eq. (3.19):

$$\mathcal{W}_{g(\lambda v)}(x) = W_{g(\lambda \tilde{v})}(x) = W_y(g(\lambda \tilde{v})x)\, W_y(x)^{-1} = V_{g(\lambda \tilde{v})}(x). \quad \square$$

The results of the above Lemmas allow for an extension of eq. (3.19) to $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$.

**Proposition 4.4** *For any $g(\lambda v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ one has*

$$(\pi(U(g(\lambda v)))\psi)(x) = C_g\, \mathcal{W}(g(\lambda v)x, x, [\gamma(v)])\psi(x), \tag{4.5}$$

*i.e.* $V_g(x) = \mathcal{W}(g(\lambda v)x, x, [\gamma(v)])$.

*Proof.* We have to prove that $\pi(U(g(\lambda v))) = \mathcal{U}(g(\lambda v))\ \forall\, v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$. In fact, both $\pi(U)$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are one parameter groups of strongly continuous unitary operators. The generator of $\mathcal{U}(g(\lambda v))$ exists on $D$ and coincides with $T_v$ there. In fact, chosen $\alpha$ with compact support and $\alpha = 1$ on $\mathrm{supp}(v)$,

$$\pi(U(g(\lambda v)))\,(1-\alpha) = 1 - \alpha = \mathcal{U}(g(\lambda v))\,(1-\alpha),$$

so that both generators vanish when multiplied by $1-\alpha$; by choosing $\alpha_i(x) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{O}_i)$, $\sum_i \alpha_i(x) = \alpha$, $\tilde{v}_i = v$ in $\mathcal{O}_i(1+\varepsilon)$, $\lambda$ small, one has on $D$, by Lemma 4.3, iii),

$$\mathcal{U}(g(\lambda v)) \sum_i \alpha_i(x) = \sum_i C_{g(\lambda \tilde{v}_i)} V_{g(\lambda \tilde{v}_i)}(x)\, \alpha_i(x) = \sum_i U(g(\lambda \tilde{v}_i))\, \alpha_i(x)$$

and therefore

$$(d/d\lambda)\, \mathcal{U}(g(\lambda v))|_{\lambda=0}\, \alpha(x) = -i \sum_i T_{\tilde{v}_i} \alpha_i(x).$$

The LR relations (Proposition 3.2), equivalently the locally Schroedinger property, and the support properties of $v_i$ give

$$\sum_i T_{\tilde{v}_i} \alpha_i = \sum_i (T_{\alpha_i \tilde{v}_i} + \tfrac{1}{2}\,[\,\tilde{v}_i,\, \alpha_i\,]) = \sum_i T_{\alpha_i v} + \tfrac{1}{2}[\,v,\, \sum_i \alpha_i\,] = T_v = T_v\, \alpha. \quad \square$$

**Theorem 4.5** *Modulo unitary equivalence a regular irreducible representation of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is characterized by the unitary irreducible representation of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$, defined by Lemma 4.2.*

*Proof.* Given two regular irreducible representations, $\pi_1, \pi_2$, of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, by Lemma 3.8 they are of the form (3.5), (3.6) in $L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and by Proposition 4.4 the corresponding $U_i(g)$ are determined by the operators $\mathcal{W}(y, x, [\gamma])$ of Lemma 4.2. By Lemma 3.8 the unitary equivalence of the two representations amounts to the existence of unitary operators $S(x)$ with

$$S(y)\, \mathcal{W}_1(y, x, [\gamma])\, S(x)^{-1} = \mathcal{W}_2(y, x, [\gamma]) \tag{4.6}$$

and this trivially implies the unitary equivalence of the corresponding representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$.

On the other hand, the unitary equivalence of the corresponding unitary representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ reads

$$\mathcal{W}_1(z, z, [\gamma]) = V_z^{-1}\, \mathcal{W}_2(z, z, [\gamma])\, V_z, \quad V_z : K_1 \to K_2; \tag{4.7}$$

then, a.e. in $z$, the operators

$$S(x) \equiv \mathcal{W}_2(x, z, [\gamma])\, V_z\, \mathcal{W}_1(x, z, [\gamma])^{-1}$$

are independent of $\gamma$ and define unitary operators $S : L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K_1 \to L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\mu) \times K_2$. In fact, given $x, x_0$ and a fixed curve $\bar\gamma(x, x_0)$, any $\gamma(x, x_0)$ may be uniquely written as $[\gamma(x, x_0)] = [\bar\gamma(x, x_0) \circ \gamma_0(x_0, x_0)]$, $\gamma_0 = \bar\gamma^{-1} \circ \gamma$; then

$$\mathcal{W}_i(x, x_0, [\gamma]) = \mathcal{W}_i(x, x_0, [\bar\gamma])\, \mathcal{W}_i(x_0, x_0, [\gamma_0])$$

and by eq. (4.7)

$$\mathcal{W}_2(x, x_0, [\gamma])\, V_{x_0}\, \mathcal{W}_1(x, x_0, [\gamma])^{-1} = \mathcal{W}_2(x, x_0, [\bar\gamma])\, V_{x_0}\, \mathcal{W}_1(x, x_0, [\bar\gamma])^{-1},$$

i.e. $S(x)$ is independent of $\gamma$. Since

$$\mathcal{W}_i(y, x_0, [\bar\gamma(y, x_0)])^{-1}\, \mathcal{W}_i(y, x, [\gamma(y, x)])\, \mathcal{W}_i(x, x_0, [\bar\gamma(x, x_0)]) =$$

$$= \mathcal{W}_i(x_0, x_0, [\bar\gamma(x_0, y) \circ \gamma(y, x) \circ \bar\gamma(x, x_0)]$$

and $V_{x_0}$ intertwines between the right hand sides of the above equation, $i = 1, 2$, one gets eq. (4.6). □

The regular irreducible representations of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ can be given a more explicit form, which also exhibits their complete characterization in terms of representations of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$. By exploiting the results of Proposition 4.4, they can be identified with Schroedinger representations on multivalued wave functions on $\mathcal{M}$, namely on wave functions on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, the universal covering space of $\mathcal{M}$.

The following notions and notations are useful: the points of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ will be denoted by the pairs $(x,[\gamma])$, with $\gamma$ a $C^\infty$ curve in $\mathcal{M}$ starting at a fixed point $x_0$ and ending at $x$; the group $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ acts naturally on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ as $g(\lambda v)\tilde{x} = g(\lambda v)(x,[\gamma]) = (g(\lambda v)x,[\gamma(v)) \circ \gamma])$, $\gamma(v)$ as in eq. (4.4); a regular immersion $x \to \tilde{x}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ into $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is given by $x \to (x,[\gamma_x])$, with $x \to \gamma_x$ a family of curves depending continuously on $x$ in an open subset of $\mathcal{M}$ with complement of zero measure.

For any given unitary representation $R$ of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ in a Hilbert space $K$, $L^2(\tilde{\mathcal{M}},K,R)$ will denote the space of locally $L^2$ wave functions $\tilde{\psi} : \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \to K$ satisfying

$$\tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma \circ \gamma_0]) = R([\gamma_0])^{-1}\tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma]), \tag{4.8}$$

with norm

$$||\tilde{\psi}||^2 \equiv ||\tilde{\psi}||^2_{L^2(\tilde{\mathcal{M}},K,R)} = \int_{x\in\mathcal{M}} d\mu(x)\, ||\psi(x,[\gamma_x])||^2_K, \tag{4.9}$$

where $d\mu(x)$ is any measure absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure $dx$ in any coordinate system. The above Hilbert norm is independent of the choice of the family $\{\gamma_x\}$ since $R$ is unitary, and different choices of $d\mu(x)$ lead to equivalent constructions.

**Theorem 4.6** *Any regular irreducible representation $\pi$ of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is unitarily equivalent to the representation $\tilde{\pi}$ in $L^2(\tilde{\mathcal{M}},K,R)$, with $R$ the unitary representation of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ associated to $\pi$ by Lemma 4.2, defined by*

$$\tilde{\pi}(U(g(\lambda v)))\tilde{\psi}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{\psi}(g(\lambda v)^{-1}\tilde{x})\, J(g(\lambda v),x), \quad \alpha\,\tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma]) = \alpha(x)\,\tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma]). \tag{4.10}$$

*Conversely, any unitary irreducible representation $R$ of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ defines a regular irreducible representation of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$, given by eqs. (4.8-10).*

*Proof.* The unitary equivalence is given by the isometry

$$T : L^2(\mathcal{M},d\mu) \times K \ni \psi(x) \to \tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma]) = \mathcal{W}(x,x_0,[\gamma])^{-1}\,\psi(x), \tag{4.11}$$

with $\mathcal{W}$ defined by eq. (4.2). In fact, by eq. (4.3)

$$\tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma\circ\gamma_0]) = \mathcal{W}(x,x_0,[\gamma\circ\gamma_0])^{-1}\,\psi(x) = \mathcal{W}(x_0,x_0,[\gamma_0])^{-1}\,\tilde{\psi}(x,[\gamma]),$$

i.e. eq. (4.8) holds and the unitarity of $T$ follows from that of $\mathcal{W}$ and eq. (4.9). Furthermore, $T$ intertwines between $\pi$ and $\tilde{\pi}$, since by Lemma 4.3

$$C_g\;\mathcal{W}(g(\lambda v)x,x,[\gamma(v,g(\lambda v)x,x)]) = \mathcal{W}(x,g(\lambda v)^{-1}x,[\gamma(v,x,g(\lambda v)^{-1}x)])\;C_g,$$

$$\mathcal{W}(x, x_0, [\gamma])^{-1}\, \mathcal{W}(x, g(\lambda v)^{-1}x, [\gamma(v, x, g(\lambda v)^{-1}x)]) =$$
$$= \mathcal{W}(g(\lambda v)^{-1}x, x_0, [\gamma(v, g(\lambda v)^{-1}x, x) \circ \gamma])^{-1},$$

and therefore, by Proposition 4.4

$$(T\ \pi(U(g(\lambda v)))\psi)\,(x, [\gamma]) = \tilde{\psi}(g(\lambda v)^{-1}x, [\gamma(v) \circ \gamma]) = \tilde{\pi}(U(g(\lambda v))\,\tilde{\psi}(x, [\gamma]).$$

The unitary equivalence obviously extends to the resolvents.
Conversely, given a unitary irreducible representation $R$ of $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ in a Hilbert space $K$, eqs. (4.8-4.10) define a LR-regular representation of the crossed product $\tilde{C}_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$. In fact, the space $C_0^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, K, R)$ of $K$-valued functions of compact support on $\mathcal{M}$ which are strongly infinitely differentiable and satisfy eq. (4.8) is dense in $L^2(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, K, R)$, since it contains the spaces defined by the extension of $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ through eq. (4.8) for all $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{M}$. $C_0^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, K, R)$ is invariant under $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$ and gives a regularity domain $D$, since the strong differentiability of $\pi(U(g(\lambda v)))$ on $D$ follows by a dominated convergence argument; the strong continuity with respect to $v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ follows similarly. The locally Schroedinger property follows from eq. (4.10), since there is no dependence on $\gamma$ for $x \in \mathcal{O}$, and implies eq. (3.1) and therefore LR regularity. By the first part of Theorem 3.7 one gets a regular representation of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$. □

# References

[1] Segal, I.: Quantization of nonlinear systems, J. Math. Phys. **1**, 468-488 (1960)

[2] Landsman, N.P.: Quantization and Superselection Sectors I. Transformation Groups $C^*$-Algebras, Rev. Math. Phys. **2**, 45-72 (1990); $C^*$-Algebraic Quantization and the Origin of Topological Quantum Effects, Lett. Math. Phys. **20**, 11-18 (1990)

[3] Mackey, G.W.: *Induced Representations*, Benjamin 1968

[4] Milnor, J.: Remarks on Infinite-Dimensional Lie Groups, in *Relativity, groups and topology II*, B.S. DeWitt and R. Stora eds., Elsevier 1984

[5] Doebner H.-D., Šťovíček P. and Tolar J.: Quantization of kinematics on configuration manifolds, Rev. Math. Phys. **13**, 1-47 (2004)

[6] Dürr D., Goldstein S., Taylor J., Tumulka R. and Zanghí N.: Topological Factors Derived From Bohmian Mechanics, Ann. H. Poincaré **7**, 791-807 (2006)

[7] Goldin, G.A.: Diffeomorphism Groups and Quantum Configurations, in *Twenty years at Bialowieza. A mathematical Antology: Aspects of Differential Geometric Methods in Physics*, S.T. Ali et al. eds., World Scientific 2005 and references therein

[8] Rinehart, G.: Differential forms for general commutative algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **108**, 195-222 (1963)

[9] Huebschmann, J.: Lie-Rinehart Algebras, Descent, and Quantization, in *Galois Theory, Hopf Algebras and Semiabelian Categories*, Fields Inst. Commun. **43**, 295-316 (2004)

[10] Landsman, N.P.: Lie Groupoids and Lie algebroids in physics and noncommutative geometry, J. Geom. Phys. **56**, 24-54 (2006)

[11] Reed, M. and Simon, B.: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Vol. I*, Academic Press 1970

[12] Takesaki, M.: *Theory of Operator Algebras I*, Springer 1979